

REMARKS

The Application presently includes claims 1-2, and 5-10. Claims 1 and 7 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia, U.S. Patent No. 5,137,595 ("Garcia"), in view of Simmons, U.S. Patent No. 4,353,763 ("Simmons"), and either one of Golden, U.S. Patent No. 5,302,221 ("Golden") or Lindsey, U.S. Patent No. 4,008,114 ("Lindsey"), or either one of Colbachini, U.S. Patent No. 4,725,326 ("Colbachini"), or Akerbahl, Great Britain Patent No. 2,075, 880 ("Akerdahl"). Claims 2, 5, 6, and 8-10 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections, and requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections and rejections and pass the application to allowance.

The rejections of claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are respectfully traversed.

1. Cited References Do Not Disclose or Suggest the Inclusion of an Automatic Brake, As Claimed by Applicant

The present invention includes an automatic brake, which works against the traction effect of the rollers. The automatic brake works in cooperation with the rollers to establish the appropriate tension in the fiberglass mesh while the formwork is being covered. Having the appropriate tension in the fiberglass mesh helps ensure that the formwork is indeformable under the pressure created when the formwork is filled with concrete. This feature is described in the specification at page 7, lines 1-6. This inclusion of this feature is found at claim 1, lines 16-19.

In the office action, Examiner does not identify where in the cited references there is an automatic brake used for the purpose of ensuring appropriate tension in the fiberglass mesh. Applicant respectfully submits the cited references do not disclose or suggest this feature. Furthermore, Applicant submits the cited references do not disclose or suggest a motivation to include an automatic break in their respective inventions. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the cited references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of claim 1, and there is

no suggestion or motivation to modify the cited references such that they would include all of the claim limitations of claim 1. Therefore Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 is allowable in its present form.

2. Claim 7 as it Depends from Claim 1 is Allowable


Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 is allowable. Thus, claim 7, which depends from an allowable claim, is also allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above Remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and seeks early indication of the same. If the Examiner requires further information with respect to this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at (847) 537-3537 for a telephonic interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 14, 2004

By: 
Marc D. Machtinger, Reg. No. 43,434
Law Office of Marc D. Machtinger, Ltd.
750 W. Lake Cook Road, Suite 350
Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089
Phone: (847) 537-3537
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 30358

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 C.F.R. § 1.8a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450, on April 14, 2004 by:


Margaret A. Swindal